

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,733	11/08/2006	Willem Theodoor Martinus Pater	313632001800	1678
25225 7590 08/01/2011 MORRISON & FOERSTER I.I.P			EXAMINER	
12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE			SAYALA, CHHAYA D	
SUITE 100 SAN DIEGO.	CA 92130-2040		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1781	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/01/2011	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EOfficeSD@mofo.com PatentDocket@mofo.com Drcaldwell@mofo.com

#### Application No. Applicant(s) PATER ET AL. 10/575,733 Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit C. Savala 1781 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,

WHIGHEVEH IS LONGEH, FROM THE MALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of them may be smalled under the provisions of 37 CR1 1/3(d), in no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SX (6) MCNTR'S from the mailing date of this communication.  In Co. proof or exply is specified above, the microarcastonic of the specified of the communication of the specified of the specified above. The microarcastonic own and the specified of the specified of the specified of the specified above. The microarcastonic own and the specified of the s
Status
The sponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 June 2011</u> .    2a  This action is FINAL.
Disposition of Claims
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7.9-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7.9-13 and 15-22 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
Attachment(s)  Attach

Application/Control Number: 10/575,733

Art Unit: 1781

### DETAILED ACTION

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/3/2011 has been entered.

In view of applicant's amended claims, the only issue that remains is as follows:

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422

Application/Control Number: 10/575,733

Art Unit: 1781

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-37, 39-53 and 56 of copending Application No. 10/418327. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '327 application claims a process of making a chew that also includes in its ingredients, starch wherein the starch is native and modified, plasticizer and fiber, making the starch into thermoplastic starch and molding this to a chew. The claims are also to a product that is similar to the one in the instant claims. Therefore, the claims are considered as varying in scope and with extensive overlap with those of the '327 application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### Conclusion

Art Unit: 1781

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Sayala whose telephone number is (571) 272-1405. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. SAYALA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1781